



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/663,531

09/16/2003

Harry L. Tuller

MIT9983

3582

55740 7590 07/09/2008

GAUTHIER & CONNORS, LLP  
225 FRANKLIN STREET  
SUITE 2300  
BOSTON, MA 02110

EXAMINER

LANDAU, MATTHEW C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2815

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/09/2008

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/663,531	<b>Applicant(s)</b> TULLER ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Matthew C. Landau	<b>Art Unit</b> 2815	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 April 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 and 16-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-10 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 11-13 and 16-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 11-13 and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kadota et al. (US PGPub 2001/0034115, hereinafter Kadota).

Regarding claims 11 and 16, Figure 8 of Kadota discloses a wide band gap semiconductor device comprising: a substrate 1; an annealed n-type ZnO layer 2 directly positioned on said substrate; and an annealed p-type ZnO 5 layer directly positioned on said n-type ZnO layer. Note that in paragraph[0040], lines 1-3, Kadota discloses that the structure shown in Figure 8 can be such that layer 5 is p-type and layer 2 is n-type. Kadota further discloses annealing the p-type ZnO film (paragraphs [0026], [0030], [0033], and [0034]). Since the p-type ZnO layer is formed above (after) the n-type ZnO film as established above, the n-type ZnO layer must also be annealed during the annealing of the p-type layer. The limitation “said annealed p-type ZnO layer uses an intrinsic donor to increase donor concentration and to obtain high impurity acceptor density of an acceptor doped material, said intrinsic donor is removed during annealing” is merely a product-by-process limitation that does not structurally distinguish the claimed invention over the prior art. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same

Art Unit: 2815

as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process. *In re Thorpe*, 227 USPQ 964, 966.

Regarding claims 12 and 17, the limitation "said acceptor-doped material is exposed to a hydrogen containing atmosphere" is merely a product-by-process limitation that does not structurally distinguish the claimed invention over the prior art.

Regarding claims 13 and 18, the limitation "said acceptor-doped material is exposed to a non-hydrogen containing atmosphere" is merely a product-by-process limitation that does not structurally distinguish the claimed invention over the prior art.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed April 9, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that "the Examiner wrongfully provided no patentable weight to the phrases "annealed n-type ZnO layer" and "annealed p-type ZnO layer" on the basis that they are product by process claim limitations" and that "the term "annealed" is used to describe a structure then the process of making that structure, in essence, the annealed n-type and annealed p-type ZnO layer were actually annealed." However, the Examiner did, in fact, provide patentable weight to the term "annealed". As indicated the above rejection, Kadota either explicitly or inherently discloses both the n-type and p-type layers are annealed. However, the Examiner did state that the limitation "uses an intrinsic donor to increase donor concentration and to obtain high impurity acceptor density of an acceptor doped material, said intrinsic donor is

Art Unit: 2815

removed during annealing” is a product-by-process limitation that does not structurally distinguish the claimed invention over the prior art. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process. *In re Thorpe*, 227 USPQ 964, 966. The burden is on Applicant to show that claimed process limitation necessarily results in a structure different from that disclosed by Kadota.

### ***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew C. Landau whose telephone number is 571-272-1731. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00AM - 5:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ken Parker can be reached on 571-272-2298. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Matthew C. Landau/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2815